



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,472	03/07/2002	Jae Shin Yu	HI-0074	9044
34610	7590	08/31/2006	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/091,472	Applicant(s) YU ET AL.	
	Examiner Quoc A. Tran	Art Unit 2176	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 08 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant amended claim 2 to include new issues (i.e. the text areas are included in original content of the video in the video stream and are extracted according to certain intervals of the video stream, the text area in the original content of the video being different from closed-caption text or text generated by a speech recognition engine....) which change the scope of the claim invention as whole, which could further required search/or consideration ...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Request for reconsideration Remarks filed 08/8/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason is set forth in the Final Office Action and Responses to Applicant Remarks mailed 05/16/2006 above and further view of the following:

Applicant's arguments Section (A) - (C) are substantially directed towards new issues as presented above in Section (3) and further view of the following.

Gibbons Gibbon is employed A GMM model consists of a set of weighted Gaussian, wherein the mean vector and covariance matrix for determining the semantically coherent text blocks, the identified topic, and the generated summary; and extracting audio features from the audio component of the multimedia data stream, the audio features being at least one of frame-level and clip level features, wherein the frame level features in three subbands are at least one of volume, zero crossing rate, pitch period, frequency centroid, frequency bandwidth, and energy ratios (see Gibbon '909 at col. 8, line 10 through col. 9 through col. 12, line 5 for detail of the calculation steps and formula of the importance computed as weighted frequency) and (see Gibbon '909 at col. 14 line 65 through col. 15 line 25), and (see Gibbon '909 at col. 8, line 10 through col. 9 through col. 12, line 5 for detail of the calculation steps and formula of the importance computed as weighted frequency). Furthermore Gibbon taught at col. 2 lines 5-30, the ability to segment multimedia data, such as news broadcasts, into retrievable units that are directly related to what users perceive as meaningful and identifying at least one target speaker using the audio and visual components, also Gibbon taught at col. 12, lines 10-30, the steps of

- (1) Adaptive granularity that is directly related to the content is achieved,
- (2) The hypothesized boundaries are more natural than those obtained using a fixed window, commonly adopted in a conventional discourse segmentation method,
- (3) Blocks formed in this way not only contain enough information for similarity comparison but also have natural breaks of chains Of repeated words if true boundaries are present,
- (4) The original task of discourse segmentation is achieved by boundary verification, and
- (5) Once a boundary is verified, its location is far more precise than what conventional discourse segmentation algorithms can achieve. This integrated multimodal analysis provides an excellent starting point for the similarity analysis and boundary detection; which Gibbon art structure is capable of performing the intended use, and then it meets the claim.

In combination with Nelson discloses the method and system for indexing multimedia document and multimedia query that includes text, image, video, audio and other (i.e. extract different type of media, and unified multimedia index, search and score then producing results). and Maybury discloses the method and system for use with Broadcast News Navigation (BNN), that enables a user to search and browse the meta data files via a computer network. The user may do so through a graphical interface using a Web browser such as Netscape, Microsoft Explorer.

Therefor without incorporates the amended features of After Final Amendments, the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of the Final Rejection mailed 05/16/2006 at this time

*William S. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**